

REMARKS

Initially, Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 3-9, 11, 13-21 and 23-67 contain allowable subject matter.

Claims 1-67 are all the claims pending in the present application. By amendment above, claims 1-3, 6, 23, 55, 58 and 59 have been amended.

Reconsideration of the subject patent application and allowance of all of the claims is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The format of the specification has been objected to for a minor informality. Applicant submits herewith a replacement specification having the appropriate spacing and being printed on A4 paper. No new matter has been added.

Claims 55-57 have been objected to for a minor informality. Claim 55 has been amended to replace the term "region" with –regions–. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the objection.

Claims 1-54 and 58-67 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Each indicated occurrence of indefiniteness has been corrected by amendment above. In view thereof, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 10, 12 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bachman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,924,418) ("Bachman"). Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bachman in view of Palalau et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,373,472) ("Palalau"). These rejections, as they may apply to the claims, as amended, are respectfully traversed.

Applicable case law holds that in order to anticipate a claim, a single prior art reference must disclose each and every feature of the claim. Furthermore, in order for prior art to render a claim obvious, the prior art must suggest all of the claimed features and their combination to a person of ordinary skill in the art. In the present case, the primary reference, Bachman, does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, and the secondary reference, Palalau, does not remedy the deficiencies of the Bachman reference.

It is asserted in the Office Action that Bachman discloses the limitations of independent claim 1. In particular, the Patent Office avers that Bachman discloses "a vehicle monitor that includes switches (12, figure 1), control means (microprocessor 46, figure 2A), an instrument panel (14, figure 1), and an RPM pulse generating means (tachometer, column 8, line 51).

Among other things, Bachman fails to teach or suggest "switch means for controlling a plurality of portions of a vehicle, the switch means including switches; switch monitor means for displaying switch functions and operational states of the switches input from the switch means; [and] switch control means for generating pulse signals corresponding to the switches operated and controlling the switch monitor means," as recited in independent claim 1. The Patent Office analogizes the pressure-sensitive type switches 12 (illustrated in Figure 1) of Bachman to Applicant's "switch means." The switches 12 of Bachman, however, "are preferably used for the entering of data into the user-accessible memory portion." Column 7, lines 8-11. The switches 12 do not control a plurality of portions of a vehicle, as recited in claim 1.

Further, the Patent Office does not identify in the Bachman reference a "switch monitor means" or a "switch control means." In fact, there is no disclosure of these limitations in the Bachman reference. Similarly, the Patent Office has failed to identify in the Bachman reference "auxiliary control means for performing input/output control, malfunction detection and automatic control of each portion of the vehicle," and there is no disclosure of such limitation in the Bachman reference.

Correspondingly, Bachman fails to teach or suggest a "central control means for performing control of the auxiliary control means and all data," as recited in claim 1. Since Bachman does not disclose an auxiliary control means, Bachman cannot teach a central control means, which controls the auxiliary control means and all data. The microprocessor 46 illustrated in Figure 2A is not analogous to the auxiliary and central control means of the claimed invention.

Further, it is asserted in the Office Action that Bachman discloses Applicant's "RPM pulse generating means for providing RPM pulses to the central control means and the auxiliary control means through an RPM pulse cable." The Patent Office relies on the text at column 8, line 51 to support this assertion. However, the text merely describes a frequency-type signal (fg) that

corresponds to the ground speed of a vehicle as sensed by a tachometer. There is no teaching or suggestion of a RPM pulse generating means for providing RPM pulses to a central control means and the auxiliary control means through an RPM pulse cable, as recited in claim 1.

Since Bachman does not teach each and every limitation of claim 1, Bachman cannot anticipate this claim. Thus, the § 102(b) rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 10, 12 and 22 depend from independent claim 1 and are submitted to be patentable over the Bachman reference for the reasons set forth above in connection with claim 1 in addition to the features they recite. For example, claim 10 recites "the switch means includes a ROM storing a systems operation program and a RAM for data processing." Bachman does not disclose a switch means having a ROM. The text at column 6, lines 18-21 simply describes a digital format that is saved in a ROM memory.

Claim 12 recites "the auxiliary control means processes through software all electrical parts of the vehicle." Since Bachman fails to teach or suggest an auxiliary control means, Bachman cannot teach this limitation.


Claim 22 recites "the central control means references integrated code data, permanently stores the integrated code data, and includes an operations system for controlling an applications program based in the integrated code data." Since Bachman fails to teach a control means, Bachman cannot teach this feature.

With respect to claim 2, the Palalau reference does not remedy the deficiencies of Bachman. The Palalau reference relates to a drive control interface system for controlling values of a plurality of features in a vehicle and displaying the information from the vehicle to the driver. Claim 2 recites "the switch means comprises panel switch means including switches in a panel configuration for the control of each portion of the vehicle remote switch means for enabling the switches of the panel switch means to be freely positioned; and means for generating pulses according to the depressed switches." Palalau does not disclose each of these limitations and the Patent Office fails to provide support for such limitations.

In re Kim
Application No. 10/019,484
Amendment dated November 28, 2003
Reply to Office Action of August 28, 2003

Moreover, the combined disclosures of Bachman and Palalau do not render claim 2 obvious because there is no motivation, absent the hindsight reconstruction of the present invention, to modify the disclosure of Bachman in accordance with the disclosure of Palalau.

Applicant submits that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action are earnestly requested.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,					
NAME AND REG. NUMBER	Monica S. Davis, Reg. No. 44,492				
SIGNATURE				DATE	11-28-03
Address	Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck 1425 K Street, N.W., Suite 800				
City	Washington	State	D.C.	Zip Code	20005
Country	U.S.A.	Telephone	202-783-6040	Fax	202-783-6031

I:\DATA\Clients\2818\2818-101.AM01.wpd